



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/758,185   | 01/14/2004  | Scott Bernard Marcak | 200314404           | 5594             |
| 22879  | 7590        | 02/23/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY<br>P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD<br>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION<br>FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400 |             |                      | PUENTE, EMERSON C   |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|  |             | 2113                 |                     |                  |

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 02/23/2007 | PAPER         |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                   |               |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |
|                              | 10/758,185        | MARCAK ET AL. |
|                              | Examiner          | Art Unit      |
|                              | Emerson C. Puente | 2113          |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

This action is made **Final**. Examiner notes applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claims 1-21 have been examined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. **103(a)** as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,884,075 of Hester et al. referred hereinafter "Hester" in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art referred hereinafter "AAPA".

Examiner notes that Hester (see column 3 lines 21-25) incorporates by reference US Patent No. 5,450,570 of Richek et al. referred hereinafter "Richek", which is introduced in the rejection below.

In regard to claim 1, Hester discloses a method of Power On Self Test resource conflict detection and reporting (see column 3 lines 17-21) comprising the steps of:

dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system (see column 1 lines 51-58);

reading the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode) (see column 3 lines 17-21), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

reallocating at least some of the resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system.

AAPA also discloses legacy software, such as OS, device drivers, and applications, which manipulates the ATA interface and assumes it may be accessed through well-known fixed resources, wherein legacy OS will not properly interface with devices, indicating a resource

conflict, if they are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts, as taught by Hester, on a system including a legacy software, such as OS, wherein resource conflicts arise when devices are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS, as taught by AAPA, thus indicating wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts (see column 3 lines 17-21), as per teachings of Hester, would enable the legacy OS(see page 2 paragraph 5), as disclosed in AAPA, to properly interface with device when an expected range is not initially allotted.

In regard to claim 2, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein the step of dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 3, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein the step of dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 4, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the step of generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises generating at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 5, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the step of generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises generating at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52 of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 6, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one parallel AT attachment subsystem (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one parallel AT attachment subsystem.

In regard to claim 7, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one serial AT attachment subsystem (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein reallocating resources according to the user-

selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one serial AT attachment subsystem.

In regard to claim 8, Hester discloses a software product stored on a computer readable medium including one or more computer executable instructions for performing a power on self test (see column 3 lines 17-21), the software product comprising:

first computer executable instructions that cause a computer to dynamically assign resources to provide electronic access to devices physically connected to the computer (see column 1 lines 51-58);

second computer executable instructions that cause a computer to read the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will

become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

fourth computer executable instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system.

AAPA also discloses legacy software, such as OS, device drivers, and applications, which manipulates the ATA interface and assumes it may be accessed through well-known fixed resources, wherein legacy OS will not properly interface with devices, indicating a resource conflict, if they are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts, as taught by Hester, on a system including a legacy software, such as OS, wherein resource conflicts arise when devices are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS, as taught by AAPA, thus indicating wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts (see column 3 lines 17-21), as per teachings of Hester, would enable

Art Unit: 2113

the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5), as disclosed in AAPA, to properly interface with device when an expected range is not initially allotted.

In regard to claim 9, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 10, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 11, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), wherein the fourth computer executable

instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 12, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein the fourth computer executable instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 13, Hester disclose a computer system comprising:

a CPU (see column 1 lines 31-35),  
a memory (see column 1 lines 31-35),  
at least one input/output bus (see column 1 lines 41-44),  
a board input/output system including logic for performing a power on self test (see column 3 lines 17-21), the power on self test logic comprising instructions that cause the CPU to dynamically assign resources to provide electronic access to devices physically connected to the at least one input/output bus (see column 1 lines 51-58);  
to read the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a

Art Unit: 2113

flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources.

Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

to reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode.

Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system.

AAPA also discloses legacy software, such as OS, device drivers, and applications, which manipulates the ATA interface and assumes it may be accessed through well-known fixed resources, wherein legacy OS will not properly interface with devices, indicating a resource conflict, if they are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts, as taught by Hester, on a system including a legacy software, such as OS, wherein resource conflicts arise

Art Unit: 2113

when devices are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS, as taught by AAPA, thus indicating wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts (see column 3 lines 17-21), as per teachings of Hester, would enable the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5), as disclosed in AAPA, to properly interface with device when an expected range is not initially allotted.

In regard to claim 14, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the instructions to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 15, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the instructions to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate the at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52 of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 16, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), wherein the instructions that reallocate resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 17, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. AAPA further discloses the system configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4), indicating wherein the instructions that reallocate resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

In regard to claim 18, Hester discloses a resource conflict detecting system comprising:  
means for dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system (see column 1 lines 51-58);  
means for reading the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

means for determining if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources and generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

means for reallocating at least some of the resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system.

AAPA also discloses legacy software, such as OS, device drivers, and applications, which manipulates the ATA interface and assumes it may be accessed through well-known fixed resources, wherein legacy OS will not properly interface with devices, indicating a resource conflict, if they are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts, as taught by Hester, on a system including a legacy software, such as OS, wherein resource conflicts arise when devices are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS, as taught by

AAPA, thus indicating wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts (see column 3 lines 17-21), as per teachings of Hester, would enable the legacy OS(see page 2 paragraph 5), as disclosed in AAPA, to properly interface with device when an expected range is not initially allotted.

In regard to claim 19, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses means for determining if the flag is in a second state and bypassing user resource conflict message generation. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). Thus, if the F10 button is not pressed, indicating a second state, then the mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode) would not be entered, indicating bypassing user resource conflict message generation.

In regard to claim 20, Hester in view of AAPA discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses means for reading compatibility mode set-up data. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read

in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode, indicating reading compatibility mode set-up data.

In regard to claim 21, Hester discloses a method for detecting and reporting resource conflicts comprising the steps of:

dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically connected to a computer system (see column 1 lines 51-58);  
reading the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode) (see column 3 lines 17-21), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

reallocating at least some of the resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the resources are serial and/or parallel ATA resources;  
wherein the device is a storage device;  
wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system.

AAPA discloses wherein parallel/serial AT attachments (PATA/SATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4). AAPA also discloses legacy software, such as OS, device drivers, and applications, which manipulates the ATA interface and assumes it may be accessed through well-known fixed resources, wherein legacy OS will not properly interface with devices, indicating a resource conflict, if they are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts, as taught by Hester, on a system including parallel/serial AT attachments (PATA/SATA) interfaces attached to a storage device and a legacy software, such as OS, wherein resource conflicts arise when devices are not allocated the range of resources expected by the legacy OS, as taught by AAPA, thus indicating wherein the resources are serial and/or parallel ATA resources, wherein the device is a storage device, and wherein the at least partial reallocation of resources is based

on a fixed assignment of resources required by a legacy operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because reallocation of resources when there are resources conflicts (see column 3 lines 17-21), as per teachings of Hester, would enable the legacy OS (see page 2 paragraph 5), as disclosed in AAPA, to properly interface with device when an expected range is not initially allotted.

*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C. Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 2113

supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*ecp*  
2/11/07

*Robert W. Beausoliel*  
ROBERT W. BEAUSOIEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
COMPUTER ART EXAMINER  
TELEPHONE NUMBER 2100